



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 9, 2005

Mr. Miles K. Risley
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City of Victoria
Legal Department
P. O. Box 1758
Victoria, Texas 77902-1758

OR2005-05057

Dear Mr. Risley:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code, the Public Information Act (the "Act"). Your request was assigned ID# 225931.

The Victoria Police Department (the "department") received a request for copies of all documents associated with the requestor's application for employment with the department. You state that the department has released some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. 540 S.W.2d at 683.

Generally, only the information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense may be withheld under common-law privacy. However, a governmental body is required to withhold an entire report when identifying information is inextricably intertwined with other releasable information or when the requestor knows the identity of the alleged victim. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982); *cf. Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have legitimate interest in such information); Open Records Decision No. 440 (1986) (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld). In this instance, the requestor knows the identity of the alleged victim. Thus, withholding only the identifying information from the requestor would not preserve the victim's common-law right to privacy. Accordingly, to protect the privacy of the individual to whom the information relates, we determine that the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101.¹

We next turn to your arguments under section 552.108(b) of the Government Code for the remainder of the submitted information. Section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from disclosure “[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution if: (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution.” Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.).

To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a law-enforcement agency must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. Instead, the governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990) (construing statutory predecessor). In addition, generally known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (1989) (Penal Code provisions, common-law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force are not protected under law enforcement exception), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known). The determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984) (construing statutory predecessor).

¹Because we reach this conclusion, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure for this information.

You assert that the release of the information at issue, consisting of the department's internal records, would interfere with law enforcement. However, the records at issue are employment application records. Records of this type were addressed by the court in *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex.App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). The court in that case stated:

we may not presume that the Legislature intended to include within the scope of section 552.108, as "information relating to law enforcement," background and reference information obtained from third parties as part of the City's application-review process. Were we to interpret section 552.108(b)(1) to include pre-employment background and reference information obtained from third parties, we believe we would be extending beyond permissible bounds the statute's plain language.

86 S.W.3d at 327. As this language indicates, section 552.108 is generally not applicable to personnel records, and you have not otherwise explained how release of the records at issue would interfere with law enforcement. See ORD 562. Therefore, no portion of the remaining submitted information may be withheld on the basis of section 552.108.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked in its entirety under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining submitted information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the

Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Robert B. Rapfogel
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RBR/krl

Ref: ID# 225931

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. William G. Horton II
2564 CR 18
Hallettsville, Texas 77964
(w/o enclosures)